

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of formal drawings include Figures 1-7. These sheets replace the original informal drawing sheets including Figures 1-7.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (Figs. 1-7)

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action mailed on August 23, 2005. Claims 1-12 and 20-25 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, 20 and 25 have been amended. Additionally, Applicants have submitted formal drawings including Figs. 1-7 which replace the originally filed informal drawings. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments made herein.

In the Office Action, the Patent Office states that new corrected drawings are required because the application was filed with informal drawings. Applicants have submitted formal drawings including Figs. 1-7.

Claim 12 was objected to based on an informality. Specifically, the Patent Office states that the phrase "the global Internet" does not have sufficient antecedent basis. Applicants have amended claim 12 to remove the antecedent basis problem and overcome the objection.

Claims 1, 2, 12, 20, 22, 23 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,029,141 to Bezos et al. ("Bezos"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of placing an electronic order from a data processing unit operated by a user that includes receiving at the data processing unit, a Web page from a hosting Web site during an interactive session between the data processing unit and a hosting server over a computer network. After the Web page is received, the Web page is displayed on a display in communication with the data processing unit. The displayed Web page includes one or more advertised products available for purchase by the user. The data processing unit then receives a purchase request to purchase an advertised product generated by the user. Then after that includes providing, via the data processing unit, an order form for the advertised product in response to the purchase request without having to exchange additional communications with the hosting server. Providing an order form includes presenting the order form on the display unit to the user where the data processing unit remains connected to the hosting Web site to continue the interactive session while the user operates an input device in communication with the data processing unit to complete the order form.

On the contrary *Bezos* is directed to an Internet based customer referral system which includes automated registration software that runs on a merchant's Web site to allow entities such as companies or individuals to register as associates. Each associate then sets up a Web site or other similar site to distribute a hypertextual catalog that includes marketing information such as product reviews, recommendations and the like about the products of the merchant (see the Abstract). *Bezos* discloses that the catalog documents 120 of the associate's Web site 100 include special hyperlinks to the merchant's Web site 106 for allowing consumers to select products for possible purchase. One hyperlink is typically included for each product. (Column 7, lines 5-20). As stated in *Bezos*, the hyperlink serves as the referral mechanism to the merchant's Web site. (Column 7, lines 18-20). In one embodiment, a shopping cart is provided. When the user clicks a button or input indicating that they want to purchase a product displayed on the Web page, the user is transferred to the Web site of the merchant via the hyperlink associated with the button. (See the Abstract; column 7, lines 9-20). The merchant then transfers the detailed product description to the user. Alternatively, the shopping cart enables the user to check out and buy products via the merchant Web site.

Therefore, when the user is connected to the merchant's Web site, the user's computer is disconnected from the associate's site. The user is therefore not linked to the associate's site anymore and thus must remember the Web site address or navigate the controls to backtrack to the Web site. In contrast, the claimed invention enables users to purchase products while remaining connected to the host server. Furthermore, in the Office Action, the Patent Office correlates the claimed data processor and host server with the client computer and the associate server of *Bezos*. However, in *Bezos*, when the user generates a purchasing request, the connection destination is switched from the associate server to the merchant server through a hyperlink. The client computer and associate server of *Bezos* therefore is different than the data processor and host server of the claimed invention.

Additionally, even if the merchant site of *Bezos* is correlated with the host server of the claimed invention, the merchant site of *Bezos* transfers the order form to the user when the user clicks the check out button. In the claimed invention, the user's data

processor or computer generates the order form itself and then is not sent from the host server. Therefore, the claimed invention is further distinguished from *Bezos*.

For at least these reasons, *Bezos* does not disclose teach or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. Thus, amended claims 1 and 20 and claims 2-12 and 21-25 which depend from these claims, respectively, are each patentably distinguished over *Bezos* and in condition for allowance.

Claims 6, 7, 21 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bezos* in view of Official Notice. Claims 6 and 7 dependent from amended claim 1 and claims 21 and 24 depend from amended claim 20. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6, 7, 21 and 24 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to amended claims 1 and 20 because the combination of *Bezos* and the Official Notice does not disclose, teach or suggest the subject matter of claims 6, 7, 21 and 24 in combination with the subject matter of amended claims 1 and 20, respectively. For these reasons, claims 6, 7, 21 and 24 are each patentably distinguished over the combination of *Bezos* and the Official Notice and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 3-5, 10, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bezos* in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0007393 to Hamel ("*Hamel*"). Claims 3-5, 10 and 11 depend from amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3-5, 10 and 11 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to amended claim 1 because the combination of *Bezos* and *Hamel* fails to disclose, teach or suggest the subject matter of claims 3-5, 10 and 11 in combination with the subject matter of amended claim 1. For these reasons, claims 3-5, 10 and 11 are patentably distinguished over the combination of *Bezos* and *Hamel* and are in condition for allowance.


Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bezos*. Claims 8 and 9 depend from amended claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8 and 9 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to amended claim 1 because *Bezos* does not disclose, teach or suggests the subject matter of claims 8 and 9 in combination with the subject matter of amended claim 1. For these reasons, claims 8 and 9 are each patentably distinguished over *Bezos* and in condition for allowance.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-12 and 20-25 are patentable and non-obvious over the art of record because the cited art does not disclose, teach or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that Claims 1-12 and 20-25 be deemed allowable at this time and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

No fees are due. If any other fees are due in connection with this application the Patent Office is authorized to deduct the fees from Deposit Account No. 19-1351. If such a withdrawal is made, please indicate the Attorney Docket No. (904809-01) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

SEYFARTH SHAW LLP

BY 
Christopher S. Hermanson
Reg. No. 48,244

Date: November 23, 2005